

their manner of eating and drinking, that is, their taking before others their own supper, but it seems to me that the supper after which Jesus gave the bread and wine was the Jews' passover, are we yet to keep that?" I answer, no. We are not to keep the Jews' passover nor any other. "We are not under the law but under grace." "For the law was given by Moses but grace and truth by Jesus Christ." The reason why this last supper could not have been the passover is because when Jesus sat down to his meal, before he ate anything, he told his disciples that he would not eat the passover, *yet he did eat of this supper*. How could what he ate of, then, be the passover? Luke 22: 14, 15, 16 says "And when the hour was come, he sat down and the apostles with him. And he said unto them, 'With desire I have desired to eat this passover with you before I suffer: for I say unto you, I will not eat it, until it be fulfilled in the kingdom of God.'" He could only *desire* to eat it, for he well knew that at the time when the passover lamb was slain that he himself would be nailed to the cross; and when the lamb was to be eaten he would be lying in the silent tomb.

Every attendant circumstance as recorded by Matthew, Mark, Luke and John confirms this position, save one. These circumstances are of the same nature, precisely, as those by which it is shown that baptism is immersion. We can only refer to them briefly. Matt. 29: 5 and Mark 14: 2 says, "Not (take Jesus) during the feast lest a tumult arise among the people." Mark 14: 12 and Luke 22: 7 says, "And on the first day of unleavened bread when they sacrificed the passover." Inspiration here recognizes THE TIME of the passover. John 13: 1, "Now before the feast of the passover." John 13: 29, "Buy what things we have need of against the feast." The apostles thus understand that the meal which they had prepared and of which Jesus ate was not the feast, but they were to buy things for it. John 18: 28, "But might eat the passover." This was several hours after Jesus had eaten his supper. John 19: 14, "Now it was the Preparation of the passover." John 19: 31, ("for the day of that Sabbath was a high day.") In the light of all that Jesus said and all that his apostles said and that the people said how could his supper have been anything else but the first Lord's supper?

Let us now notice the statement that causes many to think that Jesus kept the passover on this night. "And he sent Peter and John, saying, Go and make ready for us the passover, that we may eat." Why

our Lord was not ready to tell them that he would not eat the passover this year when Peter and John first came to ask about preparing it, is more than I know. To many, it seems absurd and even immoral that Jesus would leave such an impression when he knew he would be dead and could not eat it. I think that this is the chasm that has caused nearly all of the contention and has led to so many inventions for bridging it. But, dear reader, if Christ's statements to Peter and John concerning the preparation of the passover are to be taken as proof that *what he ate* was the passover, did you ever stop to think what you would do with the numerous expressions, all showing that he did not eat the passover? that it was still in the future when they were eating? with Jesus' own words, "For I say unto you I will not eat it," etc.? Why should it be thought strange that Christ would tell them to prepare when he knew that he could not be with them. He said to the centurion "I will come and heal him" when asked to heal his servant; but he did not go, and yet no one seems to be much excited over the incident.

The apostles looked upon the actions of the Master entirely from the human side of their natures and from such a standpoint there is nothing strange in Christ's directions to Peter and John. If we interpret Christ's actions entirely from the spiritual side of his nature it seems strange that Christ went to the garden when he knew that his persecutors would come there to take him prisoner. Why did he not go somewhere else? He knew all things and knew they would find him there. This is just as hard for me to understand as his directions to Peter and John unless I remember that it was the human side of Christ's nature that bore our sins. He acted as a perfect human being, and the fact that he knew all things did not interfere with his plan. There is nothing strange in either case when we keep ourselves in our place instead of trying to stand in Christ's place, and in his divine nature at that.

Let us, then, listen to Paul: "Wherefore, my brethren, when ye come together to eat, wait one for the other." Paul did not say it was wrong to eat a supper; church councils have, however. Whom shall we take as authority? "Heaven and earth shall pass away but my words shall not pass away" says Jesus.

#### WHAT SOME GREAT SCHOLARS SAY OF OUR POSITION.

For these and other reasons more fully developed in the Life of Christ, pp 471-483, I still hold that the Last Supper was not the actual Jewish Passover, but a quasi-Passover, a new and Christian Passover.—F. W. FARRAR, D. D., Cambridge Notes on Luke, p. 379.

Finally the meal itself fell under suspicion. Augustine and Ambrose condemned the thing itself as the apostle had condemned its excesses, and in the fifth century that which had been the original form of the Eucharist was forbidden as profane by the councils of Carthage and Laodicea. It was the parallel of the gradual extinction of the bath in baptism.—DR. STANLEY, Dean of Westminster, Christian Institutions, p. 48.

The administration of the holy communion was originally combined with a feast or meal which as symbolic of brotherly love, was called Agape.—H. E. F. GUERICKE, Manual of Antiquities, p. 245.

Agape—feasts of friendship, love or kindness, in use among the primitive Christians. It is very probable that they were instituted in memory of the last supper of Jesus Christ with his disciples, which supper was concluded before he instituted the eucharist. These festivals were kept in the assembly, or church towards evening, after prayers and worship were over.—EDWARD ROBINSON, D. D., LL. D., Bible Encyclopedia, p. 27.

But there is no doubt that at the present the weight of argument seems to lie on the side of what may be called the Johannine explanation. (John says, "Before the feast of the passover," etc., R.) Also, "The view held by Neander is worth noting. 'He foresaw that He would have to leave His disciples before the Jewish passover, and determined to give a peculiar meaning to His last meal with them, and to place it in a peculiar relation to the passover of the old covenant, the place of which was to be taken by the meal of the new covenant' (Neander, Life of Christ.)"—Hom. Com. on John, p. 372.

#### WHAT IS FEET WASHING?—JOHN 13: 1-17.

J. D. M'FADEN.

1. It was something new, it surprised Peter: "Lord, dost thou wash my feet" v. 6. Peter did not understand it. Jesus said: "What I do thou knowest not now; but thou shalt know hereafter." v. 7. Had it been for the removal of dust, Peter would have known there and then; any three year old boy would. Peter was not a fool. The feet washing was more than physical.

2. It was something that gave part with Jesus, refusal to submit would lead to excommunication. "If I wash thee not, thou hast no part with me." v. 8. Peter desired part with Christ, submission to Christ in this act would give it. The disciple then was willing to have not only feet, but head and hands washed. These need not be washed, he had been washed or bathed. v. 10. But in washing feet a lesson was to be taught.

3. It was something spiritual. "Ye are clean but not all, For he knew who should betray him, therefore, said he, 'ye are not all clean.' vs. 10, 11. He knew Judas would betray him, hence he said: "Ye are not all clean." Did he have reference to clean bodies? All could be and no doubt all were clean. The very fact that they were at such a feast is